# Neg- Pro Palestine Aff- TOC – Nirmal

# 1NC

## Strat

#### Cypress Woods, West Ranch reads this aff

#### Read one of the shells in the 1N to fuck with their time

#### Read the PIC, 2 DAs and Util Framing on case

## T Any

#### Interpretation- On the Jan/Feb 2017 topic, the aff cannot specify a single type of constitutionally protected speech that their advocacy does remove a restriction for.

#### “Any” is a negative polarity term which means that it is indefinite- especially considering that the res\* is a downward entailing operator

**Kadmon and Landman 93** [Nirit Kadmon and Fred Landman. “Any” Linguistics and Philosophy Vol 16, No. 4 Aug 1993. Springer. http://www.jstor.org/stable/25001516. ] NB

As is well known, any can function in two different ways hand, it can be a negative polarity item - POLARITY SENSITIV on the other hand, it has what is called a 'free choice' inte FREE CHOICE (FC) any. In this paper, we will propose a unifie of the semantic and pragmatic effects of any, which applies to its uses. The use of any as a negative polarity it is illustrated in (1) and (2). (1) I don't have any potatoes. (2) \*I have any potatoes. According to Ladusaw 1979's well known analysis, negative polarity items (NPIs) are only licensed if they are in the scope of a downward entailing operator. A downward entailing (DE) operator is an operator that reverses the direction of entailment, roughly as specified in (3) (using > for entailment). (3) O is a DE operator iff if A => B then O(B) = O(A). On Ladusaw's account, example (1) is OK because any is in the scope of negation, which, as illustrated in (4), is a DE operator. (4) swim = move I don't move => I don't swim In example (2), any is not licensed, because there is no DE operator that any is in the scope of. Ladusaw's analysis elegantly accounts for a wide range of examples. Besides negative vs. affirmative pairs like (1) and (2), it deals, for example, with examples (5)-(8). (5) At most three girls saw anything. (6) \*At least three girls saw anything. (7) Every girl who saw anything was happy. (8) \*Some girl who saw anything was happy. Assuming, with Generalized Quantifier Theory, that determiners are two place relations between a nominal property and a verbal property, Ladu saw predicts that (5) and (7) are OK because the determiner at most three is DE on its second argument (as well as the first) and the determiner every is DE on its first argument. (6) and (8) are out because at least three and some are not DE on either argument. Ladusaw's analysis of polarity sensitivity is quite successful. It gives semantic content to Klima 1964's suggestion that NPIs are licensed by 'affective' expressions, and it improves upon the analysis of Baker (1970), which is based on licensing by overt negation, in that the notion of DE provides a uniform account of the licensing of NPIs in examples with and without negation. However, there remain some empirical and theoretical issues that Ladusaw's analysis leaves unresolved. We now turn to such issues. We note the four issues summarized in (9), on which we will comment in turn immediately below. (9) constitutes, in fact, a summary of our goals: what we set out to do in this paper is provide an analysis of any that can successfully deal with these four issues. (9)i. the connection between PS any and FC any (goal: a unified analysis); ii. any as an expression which indicates reduced tolerance of ex ceptions; iii. the distribution of the NPI as determined by its meaning and function; iv. empirical problems with the licensing of NPIs I. THE CONNECTION BETWEEN PS ANY AND FC ANY. (10)-(12) are ex amples of free choice any. (10) Any owl hunts mice. (11) Any lawyer could tell you that. (12) I would dance with anybody. Ladusaw (1979) offers a whole battery of arguments that show beyond doubt that PS any is an indefinite with an existential meaning. (Arguments for this are also given by Horn (1972) and others.) FC any, on the other hand, seems to have universal quantificational force. And this goes beyond mere appearance. Carlson (1981) gives several arguments that FC any is in fact a universal quantifier. A strong argument is the behavior of almost. Almost is an operator that can modify only universal determiners, as illustrated in (13)-(15). (13) Almost every lawyer could answer that question (14)Almostnolawyer (15)\*Almostsomelaw As (16) and (17) show, alm strongly suggests that FC (16)Almostanylawye (17)\*Idon'thavealmo (This goes back to Horn absolutely. Note that we alm ost is a sentential ad conclusion - towards w ambiguous:PSanyisan quantifier.

#### “Any” does not tolerate exceptions, because it’s either an existential quantifier or a universal quantifier

**Kadmon and Landman 93** [Nirit Kadmon and Fred Landman. “Any” Linguistics and Philosophy Vol 16, No. 4 Aug 1993. Springer. http://www.jstor.org/stable/25001516. ] NB

What is it that any adds to the meaning of the indefinite NP? We think it contributes what we have described above as reduced tolerance of exceptions. Compare the (a) and (b) sentences in the following examples. (26)a. I don’t have potatoes. b. I don’t have any potatoes. (=(l) above) (27)a. Every man who has matches is happy. b. Every man who has any matches is happy. (28)a. An owl hunts mice. (=(22) above) b. Any owl hunts mice. (=(10) above) In some sense, the (b) sentences rule out exceptions more strongly than the (a) sentences do. Let us clarify and illustrate this point. A context of utterance sets up a domain of quantification, from which all sorts of things are excluded. For example, in a given context, rotten potatoes or sick owls may be excluded as irrelevant. For that reason, you can accept (26a) as true even if you know that I do in fact have a few rotten potatoes in the back yard, and you can accept (283) as true even if you don’t think that sick owls hunt mice. The effect of any in the (b) sentences, especially when it carries main or emphatic stress, is to indicate that even things that could previously be disregarded as irrelevant (in a given context) are no exception to the claim being made. Thus, I don’t have ANY potatoes may imply: not even rotten ones; ANY owl hunts mice may imply: even a sick one - the use of any indicates that even rotten potatoes or sick owls (which might have otherwise been disregarded) are no exception. In what follows, we will discuss several concrete cases, where we supply contexts for our example sentences. The content of utterance may implicitly or explicitly suggest that only cooking potatoes (the regular potatoes you might find in the pantry) are relevant. For example, suppose you say (29) or (30). (29) Could we make some French fries? (30) I feel like French fries. Do you have cooking potatoes today? If I utter (26a) (1 don’t have potatoes) in the context of what you have just said, I mean that I don’t have cooking potatoes. In this context, it is irrelevant that I do have, say, some potted potatoes decorating my room (on the assumption that my potted potatoes are not cooking potatoes), since non-cooking potatoes are not taken into account. Because my potted potatoes are disregarded in the context, they constitute legitimate excep- tions to the claim I made by uttering (26a). Now, suppose you say (30) and I reply by saying (26b): 1 don’t have ANY potatoes! This time, I am not just talking about the potatoes that would normally be considered relevant in the context of (30) (i.e. regular cooking potatoes); this time I am saying that I don’t have other potatoes, either. My utterance may very well imply that I am no longer in possession of the potted potatoes that you eyed hungrily on previous occasions. Even though decorative potatoes would not normally be relevant in the context of (30), the use of any may indicate that they too are no exception to the claim that I don’t have potatoes.

#### Violation-

#### 1. Specification is incompatible with “any” as an indefinite. Indefinites do not refer to particular instantiations of the resolution.

**NOD** [New Oxford Dictionary “Indefinite” adjective.] NB

lasting for an unknown or unstated length of time: they may face indefinite detention. • not clearly expressed or defined; vague: their status remains indefinite. • Grammar (of a word, inflection, or phrase) not determining the person, thing, time, etc., referred to.

#### 2. Even if “any” permits few exceptions, the aff is only a single example of the resolution, so it can’t affirm the general rule of the resolution, let alone exclude any exception

#### Standards

#### 1. Semantics- our interpretation is best aligned with the definitions of individual words and the usage of “any” in different instances. Our interp is the most grammatical and is the most objective since it doesn’t rely on arbitrary determinants of what constitutes the best type of debate- and it determines the stasis point for what we know before the round.

#### 2. Limits- They allow way too many affs if they can allow infinite specifications of types of speech in certain scenarios. Even if there are some turns, the aff is massively overprepped for them since it limits their prep burden whereas im expected to prep against each of these affs. Generics don’t solve- agent CPs or state bad Ks aren’t persuasive vs a nuanced Aff that is also heavily prepped against these. Their counterinterp proves that there’s a t version of the aff- reading it as an advantage solves their education offense and allows for a broader comparison. They explode neg prep burden and predictability which kills fairness and engagement because there isn’t sufficient literature against their position. Caselist: [zones, journalism, offensive words, political speech, advertisements, war protests, painting, not saluting, burning flag, newspapers, specific campuses, dress codes, pornography, books, religious expression, cyberspeech, organizations inside the campus, specific people, specific times, specific places, specific manners on the campuses, commercial speech, speech against specific activities, rights of individual employees on campuses, etc.]

Voter

#### 1. Fairness, debates a competitive activity, 2. Education, only portable impact. Drop the debater because A. Norms- a loss deters future abuse, B. Timeskew- drop the arg means they can kick their offense for a positive time tradeoff. C. Gateway issue- unfair args skew the rest of the round. Evaluate Competing Interps, A. reasonability is arbitrary and invites judge intervention, B. deterrence- debaters can get away with defense on theory, C. reasonability collapses into competing itnersp because we have offense defense debates about brightlines, D. it’s a binary- either the aff is topical or it’s not 5. No RVI: A. Chills theory- RVIs deter me from reading theory because good theory debaters will bait abuse and go for the RVI which causes infinite abuse. B. Kills substance- they will just collapse to the shell which ruins the possibility of us ever returning to having education. C. Illogical- you shouldn’t win for being fair. Logic is an impact because it’s the basis of argumentation. D. No abuse- you could read your own shell or prove that I violate and you don’t which equals the theory layer

## T- USFG (Cypress Woods)

#### Interpretation: The affirmative must defend that public colleges and universities ought not restrict constitutionally protected speech – to clarify they can’t defend that the federal government pass the plan.

#### United States Federal Government isn’t public universities or colleges

**Byrne 91** (J. Peter Byrne, law professor, Georgetown, 1991, Racial Insults and Free Speech Within the University, [79 Geo. L.J. 399, http://scholarship.law.georgetown.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2592&context=facpub (1991).](http://www.lexis.com/research/buttonTFLink?_m=187d924bf89603eacae34800b5cecec4&_xfercite=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b16%20Wm.%20%26%20Mary%20Bill%20of%20Rts.%20J.%201025%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_butType=3&_butStat=2&_butNum=267&_butInline=1&_butinfo=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b79%20Geo.%20L.J.%20399%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVzB-zSkAW&_md5=9ec78528a6c9b1a202cff8622d54cfe6)

Despite the rigidities of current doctrine, **a state university ought not be considered a state actor when it enacts restrictions on speech necessary to its educational purpose and its commitments to truth and humanism. For example, a university can dismiss an untenured professor because it believes his manner of speaking to be confused or banal, an authority denied the state itself.114 If one accepts that a university can ban racial insults because they hamper the search for truth or the development of students, the same ends for which untenured professors are sacked, then one should agree that the university should not be treated as a state actor when it adopts such restrictions**. "

#### 1) Ground -

#### a) Our evidence says that restrictions are completely distinct in terms of the regulatory system, which shifts the division that the res sets out – outweighs your offense since the res is the only consistent division of ground – anything else is arbitrarily constructed by debaters to skew ground to one side.

#### b) you can gain extra topical advantages based on who is passing the plan – independent voter since actors outside of the resolution are outside of the judge’s jurisdiction to vote on.

#### Ground key to fairness- it ensures that both debaters args operate on the same level

#### 2) Limits: You’re using an actor that isn’t in the resolution, which increases the # of mechanisms, which makes it impossible to prep – even if your case is predictable, using actors outside the res destroys limits and places a ridiculous prep burden on the neg, preventing me from engaging.

#### 3) textuality – the res specifies and textually requires public colleges and universities – textuality outweigh pragmatic ones – you proving another interpretation is more educational or fair is a reason only justifies that it would be more beneficial to debate another topic, not a reason we should use that definition while debating the actual one. And debating according to semantics is most pragmatic, there are an infinite number of changes to the resolution that might be more educational or fair to debate, but I can never know or prep for all of them. That’s incredibly unfair and uneducational because you will always have an advantage to your specific interpretation

#### Voter

#### 1. Fairness, debates a competitive activity, 2. Education, only portable impact. Drop the debater because A. Norms- a loss deters future abuse, B. Timeskew- drop the arg means they can kick their offense for a positive time tradeoff. C. Gateway issue- unfair args skew the rest of the round. Evaluate Competing Interps, A. reasonability is arbitrary and invites judge intervention, B. deterrence- debaters can get away with defense on theory, C. reasonability collapses into competing itnersp because we have offense defense debates about brightlines, D. it’s a binary- either the aff is topical or it’s not 5. No RVI: A. Chills theory- RVIs deter me from reading theory because good theory debaters will bait abuse and go for the RVI which causes infinite abuse. B. Kills substance- they will just collapse to the shell which ruins the possibility of us ever returning to having education. C. Illogical- you shouldn’t win for being fair. Logic is an impact because it’s the basis of argumentation. D. No abuse- you could read your own shell or prove that I violate and you don’t which equals the theory layer

## 1NC- Politics [If USFG]

### Link

#### Trump loves Anti-BDS

**Hardigan 16** [Richard Hardigan, 12-9-2016, "Anti-Semitism Awareness Act: Senate Bill Criminalizes Criticism of Israel," counterpunch.org, http://www.counterpunch.org/2016/12/09/anti-semitism-awareness-act-senate-bill-criminalizes-criticism-of-israel/]

The election of Donald Trump has had many negative consequences for supporters of the Palestinian cause. In Palestine it has raised fears that Israeli authorities will agitate for the annexation of some parts of the West Bank, which would sound the death knell of a Palestinian state.[10] In the US the powerful American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) similarly has withdrawn its support for a Palestinian state, dropping language dealing with the two-state solution from its website.[11] Anti-BDS laws are being introduced in state legislatures, and now the Anti-Semitism Awareness Act is threatening to silence all criticism of Israel.

## 1NC- PIC - Zionism

#### Text: Public colleges and universities in the United States ought not restrict any constitutionally protected speech that criticizes the State of Israel’s occupation of West Bank settlements, calls for a two-state solution, or militarization of Gaza strip

#### AND

#### Public colleges and universities ought to restrict constitutionally protected speech which repudiates Israeli statehood or perpetuates anti-Muslim myths about zionism

#### The counterplan preserves the space for a Zionist movement on campuses which argues for Israeli self-determination—Zionism is good—

#### First—violence—Jewish people have faced centuries of genocide and exclusion—Zionists continue to face anti-Semitic derision within academic spaces

**Oren 14**

Michael Oren (American-born Israeli historian, author, politician, former ambassador to the United States, and current member of the Knesset for the Kulanu party and the Deputy Minister for Diplomacy in the Prime Minister's Office). “In Defense of Zionism.” August 1st, 2014. http://www.wsj.com/articles/in-defense-of-zionism-1406918952

It is the belief that the Jewish people should have their own sovereign state in the Land of Israel. Though founded less than 150 years ago, the Zionist movement sprung from a 4,000-year-long bond between the Jewish people and its historic homeland, an attachment sustained throughout 20 centuries of exile. This is why Zionism achieved its goals and remains relevant and rigorous today. It is why citizens of Israel - the state that Zionism created - willingly take up arms. They believe their idea is worth fighting for. Yet Zionism, arguably more than any other contemporary ideology, is demonized. "All Zionists are legitimate targets everywhere in the world!" declared a banner recently paraded by anti-Israel protesters in Denmark. "Dogs are allowed in this establishment but Zionists are not under any circumstances," warned a sign in the window of a Belgian cafe. A Jewish demonstrator in Iceland was accosted and told, "You Zionist pig, I'm going to behead you." image In certain academic and media circles, Zionism is synonymous with colonialism and imperialism. Critics on the radical right and left have likened it to racism or, worse, Nazism. And that is in the West. In the Middle East, Zionism is the ultimate abomination - the product of a Holocaust that many in the region deny ever happened while maintaining nevertheless that the Zionists deserved it. What is it about Zionism that elicits such loathing? After all, the longing of a dispersed people for a state of their own cannot possibly be so repugnant, especially after that people endured centuries of massacres and expulsions, culminating in history's largest mass murder. Perhaps revulsion toward Zionism stems from its unusual blend of national identity, religion and loyalty to a land. Japan offers the closest parallel, but despite its rapacious past, Japanese nationalism doesn't evoke the abhorrence aroused by Zionism. Clearly anti-Semitism, of both the European and Muslim varieties, plays a role. Cabals, money grubbing, plots to take over the world and murder babies - all the libels historically leveled at Jews are regularly hurled at Zionists. And like the anti-Semitic capitalists who saw all Jews as communists and the communists who painted capitalism as inherently Jewish, the opponents of Zionism portray it as the abominable Other. But not all of Zionism's critics are bigoted, and not a few of them are Jewish. For a growing number of progressive Jews, Zionism is too militantly nationalist, while for many ultra-Orthodox Jews, the movement is insufficiently pious - even heretical. How can an idea so universally reviled retain its legitimacy, much less lay claim to success? The answer is simple: Zionism worked. The chances were infinitesimal that a scattered national group could be assembled from some 70 countries into a sliver-sized territory shorn of resources and rich in adversaries and somehow survive, much less prosper. The odds that those immigrants would forge a national identity capable of producing a vibrant literature, pace-setting arts and six of the world's leading universities approximated zero.

#### Second—Israel’s flourishing—the aff empowers Palestinian nationalists who refuse to negotiate a settlement and would rather destroy Israel—that leads to violence and war

**Oren 14**

Michael Oren (American-born Israeli historian, author, politician, former ambassador to the United States, and current member of the Knesset for the Kulanu party and the Deputy Minister for Diplomacy in the Prime Minister's Office). “In Defense of Zionism.” August 1st, 2014. http://www.wsj.com/articles/in-defense-of-zionism-1406918952

The answer is simple: Zionism worked. The chances were infinitesimal that a scattered national group could be assembled from some 70 countries into a sliver-sized territory shorn of resources and rich in adversaries and somehow survive, much less prosper. The odds that those immigrants would forge a national identity capable of producing a vibrant literature, pace-setting arts and six of the world's leading universities approximated zero. Elsewhere in the world, indigenous languages are dying out, forests are being decimated, and the populations of industrialized nations are plummeting. Yet Zionism revived the Hebrew language, which is now more widely spoken than Danish and Finnish and will soon surpass Swedish. Zionist organizations planted hundreds of forests, enabling the land of Israel to enter the 21st century with more trees than it had at the end of the 19th. And the family values that Zionism fostered have produced the fastest natural growth rate in the modernized world and history's largest Jewish community. The average secular couple in Israel has at least three children, each a reaffirmation of confidence in Zionism's future. Indeed, by just about any international criteria, Israel is not only successful but flourishing. The population is annually rated among the happiest, healthiest and most educated in the world. Life expectancy in Israel, reflecting its superb universal health-care system, significantly exceeds America's and that of most European countries. Unemployment is low, the economy robust. A global leader in innovation, Israel is home to R&D centers of some 300 high-tech companies, including Apple, Intel and Motorola. Not to mention, the beaches are teeming, the rock music is awesome, and the food is off the Zagat charts. The democratic ideals integral to Zionist thought have withstood pressures that have precipitated coups and revolutions in numerous other nations. image Israeli Knesset Inaugural Ceremony - Givat Ram, Jerusalem 1996. Today, Israel is one of the few states - along with Great Britain, Canada, New Zealand and the U.S. - that has never known a second of nondemocratic governance. These accomplishments would be sufficiently astonishing if attained in North America or Northern Europe. But Zionism has prospered in the supremely inhospitable - indeed, lethal - environment of the Middle East. Two hours' drive east of the bustling nightclubs of Tel Aviv - less than the distance between New York and Philadelphia - is Jordan, home to more than a half million refugees from Syria's civil war. Traveling north from Tel Aviv for four hours would bring that driver to war-ravaged Damascus or, heading east, to the carnage in western Iraq. Turning south, in the time it takes to reach San Francisco from Los Angeles, the traveler would find himself in Cairo's Tahrir Square. In a region reeling with ethnic strife and religious bloodshed, Zionism has engendered a multiethnic, multiracial and religiously diverse society. Arabs serve in the Israel Defense Forces, in the Knesset and on the Supreme Court. While Christian communities of the Middle East are steadily eradicated, Israel's continues to grow. Israeli Arab Christians are, in fact, on average better educated and more affluent than Israeli Jews. In view of these monumental achievements, one might think that Zionism would be admired rather than deplored. Rather, Zionism stands accused of thwarting the national aspirations of Palestine's indigenous inhabitants, of oppressing and dispossessing them. Never mind that the Jews were natives of the land - its Arabic place names reveal Hebrew palimpsests - millennia before the Palestinians or the rise of Palestinian nationalism. Never mind that in 1937, 1947, 2000 and 2008, the Palestinians received offers to divide the land and rejected them, usually with violence. Never mind that the majority of Zionism's adherents today still stand ready to share their patrimony in return for recognition of Jewish statehood and peace. image The response to date has been, at best, a refusal to remain at the negotiating table or, at worst, war. But Israelis refuse to relinquish the hope of resuming negotiations with President Mahmoud Abbas of the Palestinian Authority. To live in peace and security with our Palestinian neighbors remains the Zionist dream.

#### Third—sovereignty—having sovereignty is about making tough choices—regardless of the West Bank question, Israeli security and self-determination should be prioritized

**Oren 14**

Michael Oren (American-born Israeli historian, author, politician, former ambassador to the United States, and current member of the Knesset for the Kulanu party and the Deputy Minister for Diplomacy in the Prime Minister's Office). “In Defense of Zionism.” August 1st, 2014. http://www.wsj.com/articles/in-defense-of-zionism-1406918952

Still, for all of its triumphs, its resilience and openness to peace, Zionism fell short of some of its original goals. The agrarian, egalitarian society created by Zionist pioneers has been replaced by a dynamic, largely capitalist economy with yawning gaps between rich and poor. Mostly secular at its inception, Zionism has also spawned a rapidly expanding religious sector, some elements of which eschew the Jewish state. About a fifth of Israel's population is non-Jewish, and though some communities (such as the Druse) are intensely patriotic and often serve in the army, others are much less so, and some even call for Israel's dissolution. And there is the issue of Judea and Samaria—what most of the world calls the West Bank—an area twice used to launch wars of national destruction against Israel but which, since its capture in 1967, has proved painfully divisive. Many Zionists insist that these territories represent the cradle of Jewish civilization and must, by right, be settled. But others warn that continued rule over the West Bank's Palestinian population erodes Israel's moral foundation and will eventually force it to choose between being Jewish and remaining democratic. Yet the most searing of Zionism's unfulfilled visions was that of a state in which Jews could be free from the fear of annihilation. The army imagined by Theodor Herzl, Zionism's founding father, marched in parades and saluted flag-waving crowds. The Israel Defense Forces, by contrast, with no time for marching, much less saluting, has remained in active combat mode since its founding in 1948. With the exception of Vladimir Jabotinsky, the ideological forbear of today's Likud Party, none of Zionism's early thinkers anticipated circumstances in which Jews would be permanently at arms. Few envisaged a state that would face multiple existential threats on a daily basis just because it is Jewish. Confronted with such monumental threats, Israelis might be expected to flee abroad and prospective immigrants discouraged. But Israel has one of the lower emigration rates among developed countries while Jews continue to make aliyah—literally, in Hebrew, "to ascend"—to Israel. Surveys show that Israelis remain stubbornly optimistic about their country's future. And Jews keep on arriving, especially from Europe, where their security is swiftly eroding. Last week, thousands of Parisians went on an anti-Semitic rant, looting Jewish shops and attempting to ransack synagogues. American Jews face no comparable threat, and yet numbers of them continue to make aliyah. They come not in search of refuge but to take up the Zionist challenge—to be, as the Israeli national anthem pledges, "a free people in our land, the Land of Zion and Jerusalem." American Jews have held every high office, from prime minister to Supreme Court chief justice to head of Israel's equivalent of the Fed, and are disproportionately prominent in Israel's civil society. Hundreds of young Americans serve as "Lone Soldiers," without families in the country, and volunteer for front-line combat units. One of them, Max Steinberg from Los Angeles, fell in the first days of the current Gaza fighting. His funeral, on Mount Herzl in Jerusalem, was attended by 30,000 people, most of them strangers, who came out of respect for this intrepid and selfless Zionist. I also paid my respects to Max, whose Zionist journey was much like mine. After working on a kibbutz—a communal farm—I made aliyah and trained as a paratrooper. I participated in several wars, and my children have served as well, sometimes in battle. Our family has taken shelter from Iraqi Scuds and Hamas M-75s, and a suicide bomber killed one of our closest relatives. Despite these trials, my Zionist life has been immensely fulfilling. And the reason wasn't Zionism's successes—not the Nobel Prizes gleaned by Israeli scholars, not the Israeli cures for chronic diseases or the breakthroughs in alternative energy. The reason—paradoxically, perhaps—was Zionism's failures. Failure is the price of sovereignty. Statehood means making hard and often agonizing choices—whether to attack Hamas in Palestinian neighborhoods, for example, or to suffer rocket strikes on our own territory. It requires reconciling our desire to be enlightened with our longing to remain alive. Most onerously, sovereignty involves assuming responsibility. Zionism, in my definition, means Jewish responsibility. It means taking responsibility for our infrastructure, our defense, our society and the soul of our state. It is easy to claim responsibility for victories; setbacks are far harder to embrace. But that is precisely the lure of Zionism. Growing up in America, I felt grateful to be born in a time when Jews could assume sovereign responsibilities. Statehood is messy, but I regarded that mess as a blessing denied to my forefathers for 2,000 years. I still feel privileged today, even as Israel grapples with circumstances that are at once perilous, painful and unjust. Fighting terrorists who shoot at us from behind their own children, our children in uniform continue to be killed and wounded while much of the world brands them as war criminals. Zionism, nevertheless, will prevail. Deriving its energy from a people that refuses to disappear and its ethos from historically tested ideas, the Zionist project will thrive. We will be vilified, we will find ourselves increasingly alone, but we will defend the homes that Zionism inspired us to build. The Israeli media have just reported the call-up of an additional 16,000 reservists. Even as I write, they too are mobilizing for active duty—aware of the dangers, grateful for the honor and ready to bear responsibility.

## 1NC- Econ DA

#### Palestine econ growth now

**PMA 17** [Palestine Monetary Authority (PMA), 2015. Economic Forecast Report, 2017. ] NB

PMA economic forecasts included primarily predictions with respect to developments of key Palestinian macro-economic variables during 2017 under the baseline scenario1. 0F These predictions were coupled with two other sets of forecasts (optimistic and pessimistic scenarios) based on a risk assessment of different shocks of varying likelihood expected to impact on economic performance positively or negatively, compared to the baseline assumptions. It is noteworthy that all the above-mentioned forecasts are sensitive to any revisions of previous years’ actual data published by official data-producing agencies, most importantly the Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics and the Ministry of Finance. Basic forecasts for Palestinian economic performance during 2017 were founded on a set of basic assumptions (baseline scenario) and their associated implications for economic conditions. These assumptions were: No significant change will occur in the political or security conditions, particularly concerning the restrictions imposed at crossings on freedom of movement of people and trade. Meanwhile, the increase in the number of Palestinian workers in Israel will stand around previous-year levels, with the pattern of GS reconstruction process remaining essentially unchanged from 2016 to 2017.   The government will continue to follow a fiscal austerity policy and implement current-expenditure rationing, while growth in government revenues and expenditures remains relatively unchanged from previous-year levels.   Foreign grants extended by donor countries to the government’s treasury will continue to decline, totalling about USD 0.5 billion during 2017.   Private sector transfers from abroad will exceed USD 1 billion during 2017.   Credit facilities granted to the private sector by banks operating in Palestine will  rise by 15 percent, as compared to 2016.   Cost of imports (inflation rate and exchange rate with trading partners) will rise by 2.8 percent, (based on forecasts of international institutions, primarily the IMF and World Bank).   The weighted real GDP growth rate of Palestine’s main trading partners will increase to 3 percent, (based on Bank of Israel forecasts).   Based on these assumptions, PMA forecasts a real growth during 2017 by 3.1 percent, to around USD 8,221 million, compared with 3.3 percent during 20162. This growth is 1F expected to raise real per capita income (real GDP per capita) by 0.8 percent to USD 1,776, compared to a rise of about 1.0 percent in 2016. As was the case in 2016, real GDP growth during 2017 will be primarily underpinned by an increase in private consumption financed by further expansion in bank credit and the swelling of arrears. Real GDP growth will be additionally favorably affected by the upturn in total investment, particularly relating to the reconstruction process in GS, its slow pace, notwithstanding.

#### BDS wrecks Palestine’s economy

**Sheffield 15** [Carrie Sheffield, Feb 22 2015, "Boycott Israel Movement Stunts The Palestinian Economy," Forbes, <https://www.forbes.com/sites/carriesheffield/2015/02/22/boycott-israel-movement-stunts-the-palestinian-economy/#60fcb616484c>] NB

A push to “boycott, divest and sanction” (BDS) Israeli companies has limited impact on the credit profile of Israel, yet it directly harms its intended beneficiaries, the Palestinians. The BDS movement, including universities, pension funds and leaders of some Christian denominations (to the chagrin of many congregants), ignores economic data. And it coincides with a disturbing rise of violent [anti-Semitism across Europe](http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2015/02/anti-semitism-europe-france-grave-desecration-Zvika-Klein/385547/). “The impact of BDS is more psychological than real so far and has had no discernible impact on Israeli trade or the broader economy,” Kristin Lindow, senior vice president at Moody's Investors Service and Moody’s lead analyst for Israel (in full disclosure, a former Moody’s colleague) told Forbes. “That said, the sanctions do run the risk of hurting the Palestinian economy, which is much smaller and poorer than that of Israel, as seen in the case of SodaStream.” While the broader Israeli economy is presently shielded from BDS, one victim is SodaStream, an Israeli company manufacturing DIY soda that shuttered a West Bank factory and moved it to southern Israel. This cut hundreds of jobs for Palestinians that reportedly paid between three and five times the local prevailing wage. SodaStream’s CEO Daniel Birnbaum denied the move was BDS-related, though its profits plunged after BDS activists locked the fizzy pop maker in its crosshairs. "It has nothing to do with politics; we're relocating to a modern facility that is three times the size," [Birnbaum told TheIndependent](http://www.independent.co.uk/news/business/analysis-and-features/the-bubble-bursts-for-sodastream-9829869.html). "But if it was up to me, I would have stayed. We showed the world Arabs and Jews can work together." The numbers speak for themselves: Israel (population 8.3 million) has GDP of $291 billion, the Palestinian Territories (population 4.1 million), [$11.3 billion](http://data.worldbank.org/country/west-bank-gaza). In 2012, Israeli sales to the Palestinian Authority were $4.3 billion, about 5% of Israeli exports (excluding diamonds) less than 2% of Israeli GDP, [according to the Bank of Israel](http://www.boi.org.il/en/NewsAndPublications/RegularPublications/Research%20Department%20Publications/RecentEconomicDevelopments/develop137e.pdf). In 2012, Palestinian sales to Israel accounted for about 81% of Palestinian exports and less than a percentage point of Israeli GDP. Palestinian purchases from Israel were two-thirds of total Palestinian imports (or 27% of Palestinian GDP). Such trade flow asymmetry shows Palestine needs Israel, economically speaking. Yet the BDS crowd would impair economic ties between these areas, despite evidence that trade between peoples lessens outbreak of war. BDS-ers want to obliterate the vast trade surplus Israel extends to Palestine and offer nothing in its place. It’s easy to cast digital stones from the comfort of a [California dorm room](http://www.foxnews.com/us/2015/02/03/pro-palestinian-students-heckle-cal-davis-opponents-with-cries-allahu-akbar/) or [a posh British mansion](http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-4628946,00.html). It’s difficult to gainfully employ [some 110,000 Palestinians](http://www.pcbs.gov.ps/portals/_pcbs/PressRelease/Press_En_LFSQ22014E.pdf) as Israel does, or build [16 industrial parks](http://www.nytimes.com/2014/02/11/world/middleeast/palestinians-work-in-west-bank-for-israeli-industry-they-oppose.html) in the West Bank and East Jerusalem hosting 1,000 facilities where Jews and Arabs work shoulder-to-shoulder. Despite overheated BDS rhetoric about exploitation, last year [the Palestinian Authority’s official newspaper hailed](http://www.timesofisrael.com/palestinians-better-off-working-for-israelis-says-pa-daily/) working conditions for Palestinians employed by Israelis in West Bank settlements. It also scolded Palestinians hiring other Palestinians for low wages with no benefits.

#### Large amount of Palestinian investors in Israel

**AMEINU 16** [“What’s the Problem With BDS? A Progressive Critique” The Third Narrative- Two states, peace and justice for Israelis and Palestinians. AMEINU.2016/02] NB

For another, large numbers of Palestinian entrepreneurs – 16,000 of them, at the last count – heavily invest in the stable Israeli economy. According to researchers at Al-Quds University, Palestinian investments in Israeli businesses dwarf those made in their own territories.12

#### Turns case – economic ties between the two countries foster interdependence which deters conflict – neither Palestinians nor Israelis would fight broader conflicts because of trade dependence on each other

#### External impact- they hurt investment in key technology for rest of the world

**Mezei 16** [Jacob Mezei. Kstaubi2@Illinois.Edu, 1-4-2016, "Why Everyone Should Condemn the BDS Movement," No Publication, <https://publish.illinois.edu/illinoisblj/2016/01/04/why-everyone-should-condemn-the-bds-movement/>] NB

BDS not only hurts Palestinians, but it hurts the rest of the world because it convinces educated people to abandon technology and innovation that, in some instances, is life saving, and, in other instances, is extremely important for the technological and scientific progress of mankind. Israel is perhaps the most technologically advanced country in the Middle East and brings a lot to the world in terms of innovation in science and technology.[[18]](https://publish.illinois.edu/illinoisblj/2016/01/04/why-everyone-should-condemn-the-bds-movement/" \l "_edn18) The list of Israeli contributions in technology and science over the past 65 years is astounding. The list includes cancer screening technologies, drip irrigation, desalinization, drone aircraft, computer processors, Leukemia treatment, the only non-interferon Multiple Sclerosis treatment, nanowire technology, flash drives, micro-computer technology, the Centrino computer chip, tumor imaging, Parkinson’s treatment, bionic exoskeletons to help paraplegics walk, breast tumor treatment, missile defense system (or Iron Dome), type 1 diabetes treatment, the collider that detected the “God Particle,” and much more.[[19]](https://publish.illinois.edu/illinoisblj/2016/01/04/why-everyone-should-condemn-the-bds-movement/" \l "_edn19) So when the supporters of the BDS movement argue for a boycott of Israeli goods and services, as well as academic and cultural boycotts, they argue to boycott the technology and science that was engineered, invented, and discovered by Israelis in Israel, including everything mentioned above and a lot more. This is a dangerous movement that benefits no one. If you truly believe in the BDS movement you should throw away your cell phone and discard your MacBook, as some of the technology in both was either invented or engineered in Israel. However, that is not what BDSers do. Instead, they choose to boycott certain things that they do not need/use on a daily basis and choose to purchase, use, sell, and enjoy Israeli products when it is convenient and necessary (which is most of the time).[[20]](https://publish.illinois.edu/illinoisblj/2016/01/04/why-everyone-should-condemn-the-bds-movement/" \l "_edn20)

#### Palestinian economic decline creates social unrest—that has consequences for security

**Gal 15**

Yitzhak Gal (received his MBA from Tel Aviv University in 1979, co-chair of the Dayan Center Middle East Economic Forum). “The Palestinian Economy, Gaza Reconstruction, and Israel: Crises and Possibilities.” Iqtisadi, vol. 5, no. 7. July 2015.

Several studies indicate high growth potential for the Palestinian economy. This huge potential can be tapped, if political stability is achieved, and given a change in the economic eco-system that removes barriers and encourages sustainable economic growth. 14 Such a new political and economic eco-system would release the growth potential of the large and highly-educated Palestinian labor force, and the unused industrial and agricultural production capacities in the Palestinian territories. It would also benefit tourism and other productive branches of the economy. Beyond this, export-oriented growth is expected to be greatly improved by investment in the presently underdeveloped economic infrastructure (transport, energy, water, and other infrastructures). In an environment that supports economic growth, the Palestinian economy will be able to benefit both from its access to the Israeli market and from its access to the large Arab markets, particularly the wealthy Arab Gulf States. In conclusion, the structural weaknesses of the Palestinian economy described earlier in this article are largely the result of the political impasse between Israel and the PA, and affect all aspects of economic and social life of the PA. As the economic and budget crises continue and deepen, economic damage and social problems also accumulate, potentially leading to dangerous political and security consequences. The generous foreign aid the PA received, which enabled it to operate for the last decade and a half, was designed to support the Israeli-Palestinian peace process. Therefore, it is not surprising that the prolonged deadlock in the peace process has gradually weakened the donor countries’ commitment, reflected in the steady decline in foreign aid to the PA since 2010. The political context of economic aid to PA was stated in the donor conference which convened in Brussels in May 2015, as follows: "The financial assistance aims to underpin the political process by supporting the building of sustainable institutions for a Palestinian state. The donors emphasized that it is urgent to take steps to rebuild trust and help create the conditions necessary for resuming future negotiations." On the other hand, the positive developments described in the second half of this article, and Israel’s willingness to deal with the Palestinian economic crisis and the challenge of rebuilding Gaza, create new opportunities. Some of the research includes detailed plans that, if implemented, could help move the Palestinian economy onto a new path to growth.

## 1NC- Stability DA

#### Israel-Palestine peace process coming now

**Kornbluh 4-6** [Jacob Kornbluh, Jewish Insider, 4-6-2017, "We need to 'seize opportunity' with Trump, Palestinian official says — Jewish Journal," Jewish Journal, <http://jewishjournal.com/news/israel/217600/need-seize-opportunity-trump-palestinian-official-says/>] NB

Conditions are ripe for a regional peace initiative given President Donald Trump’s interest in achieving a peace settlement between Israel and the Palestinians with the backing of Arab countries, says IDF Brigadier General (Res.) Michael Herzog, who was involved in every round of negotiations since the Oslo Accords, including in the years 2013-2014 on behalf of Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. During a panel on the Israeli-Palestinian peace process with Jibril Rajoub, Secretary of the Fatah Central Committee, hosted by the Israel Policy Forum in New York on Wednesday, Herzog said that one of the reasons the most recent regional peace initiative ([in 2016](http://www.haaretz.com/israel-news/.premium-1.775258)) fell apart was because the Obama administration didn’t want to be part of it. “I think they did not believe that this would yield results. To my knowledge, both sides – the Israelis and Palestinians – did not trust the [Obama] Administration to be the leading part of that initiative and the administration didn’t want to be part of it,” he explained. The principles of the initiative were agreed upon during a secret peace summit between Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and Jordan’s King Abdullah II and Egyptian President Abdel Fattah al-Sissi in Aqaba, according to a report by [Haaretz](http://www.haaretz.com/israel-news/.premium-1.772531). The proposal later served as a basis for talks between Netanyahu and Opposition Leader Isaac Herzog on joining a national unity government. As reported by [Haaretz](http://www.haaretz.com/israel-news/.premium-1.775258), the plan was laid to rest after the coalition talks fell through in late 2016. During Netanyahu’s meeting with President Trump in February, the two leaders agreed on reviving that plan with the backing of Saudi Arabia and other countries in the Gulf region. “This administration is willing to involve the region in the peace process,” said Herzog. “I still don’t know how they are going to design the process. I don’t know if they have a strategy yet. We just have to wait and see. But it’s clearly a priority for this administration.” Following a meeting with King Abdullah of Jordan on Wednesday, Trump said, “I’m working very, very hard on trying to finally create peace between the Palestinians and Israel, and I think we’ll be successful,” The President called Abdullah a “tireless advocate” for a peace settlement “and he’s going to help me with that and help me at the highest level. And we will be consulting with him closely in the days ahead.” Rajoub, after expressing regret at some of his past statements and promising to be more cautious in the future, agreed that the Palestinians need to “seize this opportunity” with the Trump Administration to renew peace talks. Asked if the Palestinians would agree to enter into negotiations without a full settlement freeze, Rajoub told Jewish Insider, “The settlements, believe me, brother, its existence is a threat to the state of Israel. We are talking about two states – with two territories. Why expand it? Listen, I think it’s the time to freeze all settlement activities. Believe me, it’s a benefit to the Israelis like it’s a benefit to the Palestinians.” According to Herzog, Trump has leverage on the Palestinian Authority to bring them to the negotiation table if Israel follows through with the new policy restraint in settlement activity. “I think the Palestinians will demand a freeze,” Herzog told Jewish Insider after the event. “However, I believe that if the Trump Administration pushes them to enter negotiations even with Israel just restraining settlement activity, I don’t think they have an alternative. I do think Trump has leverage over them. You don’t want to mess with him. And since he prioritizes the peace process and wants a deal, he has leverage on them. They will have to do with some kind of restraint, and if he pressed them they will follow.”

#### BDS worsens Israel-Palestine relations—Palestinian leaders don’t want it and it trades off with important movements

**AMEINU 16** [“What’s the Problem With BDS? A Progressive Critique” The Third Narrative- Two states, peace and justice for Israelis and Palestinians. AMEINU.2016/02] NB

To bolster their legitimacy, BDS advocates outside of the occupied territories often assert that they are answering a call from “Palestinian civil society.” But while mobilizing support, they generally neglect to mention that their campaigns are not endorsed by the internationally acknowledged representatives of the Palestinian people, the PLO and the Palestinian Authority (PA), as well as other important Palestinians. "No, we do not support the boycott of Israel," Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas told reporters in South Africa, although the PA does support a boycott of settlements. 7 One of Abbas’ advisors, Majdi Khaldi, said, "We are neighbors with Israel, we have agreements with Israel, we recognize Israel, we are not asking anyone to boycott products of Israel."8 Sari Nusseibeh, the President of Al-Quds University and a widely respected educator in East Jerusalem, has spoken out against academic boycotts of Israel.9 Bassam Eid, founder of the Palestinian Human Rights Monitoring Group, has this to say about BDS: “For our own sake, we need to reconcile with our Israeli neighbors, not reject and revile them.”10 The iconic Edward Said believed it was “fatuous to impose total blockades against everything Israeli (now in fashion in various progressive Arab circles) and to pretend that that is the really virtuous nationalist path.”11 As Jake Wallis Simons reports in The Telegraph: From the Palestinian point of view, the arguments against BDS are quite straightforward. For one thing, BDS gives the distinct impression that the Palestinian side has no interest in the pursuit of compromise, peace and the two- state solution; activists have managed to block a succession of attempts at dialogue between ordinary Israelis and Palestinians in Ramallah and East Jerusalem.

#### Risk of Israel-Palestine conflict is high now

**Kydd 16**

Andrew Kydd (received his Ph.D. in political science from the University of Chicago in 1996 and taught at the University of California, Riverside and Harvard University before joining the Department of Political Science at the University of Wisconsin in the fall of 2007). “The Israeli-Palestinian Cold War, or Temporary Peace Through Incompatible Expectations.” June 29th, 2016. https://politicalviolenceataglance.org/2016/06/29/the-israeli-palestinian-cold-war-or-temporary-peace-through-incompatible-expectations/

My impression of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict today is that it has entered a Cold War phase. In their conflict, the US and the Soviet Union pursued a long term struggle with the adversary. Crucially, each side thought they would prevail over the long haul through economic growth, military spending, and the competition for allies in the third world. This expectation of long term success meant that both sides preferred to avoid both all out conflict and serious negotiations over their differences. However, since power is relative, at least one side had to be wrong, in this case the Soviet Union. Once that became clear, the two sides negotiated settlements of their outstanding differences, which lasted until Russia regained a degree of its former power and began to contest the post-Cold War settlement. Similarly, in the Israeli-Palestinian case the two sides are avoiding both all out conflict and negotiations. The two state solution has been abandoned and the parties are back to pursuing incompatible one state solutions. Both sides expect to grow stronger over time. Of course, time cannot be on both sides, so someone will eventually realize that their relative position is weakening rather than strengthening. At that point another critical juncture will arise for negotiations or a return to conflict. On the Israeli side, the thinking seems to be as follows: A two state solution would involve painful compromises over territory in the West Bank that is important both for ideological and security reasons. Even if a two state solution were implemented, Israel would not get peace for the land, because the Palestinians would arm themselves and attack in the future. The current system, however, keeps the Palestinians weak and minimizes the threat they pose. The Wall protects Israel from terrorist attacks such as those of the early 2000s. The Iron Dome, combined with punishment raids into Gaza and Lebanon, protects Israel from rocket attacks. Occasional flare-ups of violence can be handled by the security forces and serve to further justify the uncompromising strategy. The current threat environment is therefore manageable. There are no rewards to be gained for making concessions and no cost to be paid for not making them. Israel can even afford to gradually extend its settlements into strategic areas of the West Bank since the Palestinians are too weak to do anything about it and international condemnation is largely toothless. On the Palestinian side, the Palestinian Authority leadership appears too weak to sell painful compromises to its people. A decade of peace with Israel has produced no results and brought them not a millimeter closer to a Palestinian state – even just on the West Bank, leaving aside Gaza – further undermining the authority of the PA. Instead, the Israelis continue to build and extend their settlements. A strategy of violent opposition also seems hopeless, however, since the Wall makes it easier for the Israelis to stop terrorist attacks. So the Palestinians seem to have fallen back on the demographic strategy. Eventually, given the higher Palestinian birthrate, Palestinians will outnumber Israeli Jews between the river and the sea. At that point, they will demand equal political rights in the one state covering that territory. By analogy to the end of apartheid in South Africa, eventually this struggle will succeed and Palestinians will govern Palestine once more, with a Jewish minority. The demographic trends once persuaded even Israeli hawks, such as Ariel Sharon, to support disengagement and an eventual two state solution. The fact that they no longer do suggests that hawks have some answer to this question that is at least persuasive to themselves. Three broad options seem available. One is to permanently disenfranchise the West Bank Palestinians, to just say no to their demands for equal rights. The second is to make life so hard for the Palestinians that many eventually leave for Jordan or other Arab countries. A third possibility is evicting the Palestinians by force. The Palestinians and surrounding Arab states would of course protest any of these options vigorously. However, they alone might not be able to inflict sufficient costs on Israel to prevent it from pursuing their chosen course of action. The real downside comes from the broader international community. Israel depends upon economic ties and decent political relations with European countries and the United States. Those ties are beginning to fray. The BDS movement is but the tip of the iceberg. The idea of boycotting Israeli academics is idiotic and has been soundly defeated even in left leaning, pro-Palestinian academic professional associations. While such boycotts would be symbolic in any case, the real potential threat is economic boycotts. Consumers worldwide, but particularly in Europe and the US, are increasingly concerned with the provenance of the goods they purchase. They buy fair trade coffee, sweatshop-free clothing, organic foods, etc. An open move towards an apartheid system, to say nothing of of ethnic cleansing, will make an economic boycott of Israel a no-brainer for these consumers. This will likely be a boycott not just of goods produced in the occupied territories, but all goods produced in Israel. Israeli hawks may argue that any boycotts that arise are a product of anti-Semitism – of which there is certainly no shortage in the world – and are not conditional on Israeli behavior. However, in Europe and the United States it is a fringe view, and certainly not held by the center or anything close to a majority of the population. The broad electorate in the US and Europe is only reluctantly coming to embrace a view that the Israeli policy is unjust and unsustainable, and that pressure from outside is required. The current Israeli government seems to feel that the only political party whose support Israel requires is the Republican party of the United States. Indeed, Republicans would probably support Israel regardless of their policy towards the Palestinians, whereas the support of Democrats, and most European parties, is conditional on not treating them too badly. It was recently argued in a New York Times op-ed that Israel has a “problem” with the Democratic party. Unfortunately, pursuing the one state solution is going to make that problem, and the problem with most European parties, worse as time goes by. Even the once rock solid Republican party is beginning to show strains, as Trump takes over the Presidential nomination and leads the party into uncertain waters. What this all bodes for the future is unclear. Bargaining theory tells us that when two conflicting sides involved in bargaining both think their bargaining power will increase in the future, they have incentives to avoid conflict and negotiations now and bide their time, as in the Cold War. However, since all power is relative, both sides cannot be correct about these expectations indefinitely. At some point, one side will realize that it is not getting stronger, but weaker. At that point there may be successful negotiations or there may be a return to conflict. The Cold War ended peacefully because the declining power, the Soviet Union, had nuclear weapons and could protect its vital interests even as it made substantial concessions. If Israel eventually discovers it is the declining party, its nuclear weapons and overall strength may make for peaceful negotiations once again. If the Palestinians realize they are the declining party, they will have no means of protecting their vital interests and so may opt for conflict. In any event, betting on successful negotiations would be optimistic – especially given historical experience in the region – so a return to conflict seems more likely.

#### Goes nuclear

**Nawash 9**

Kamal Nawash (Palestinian-born American lawyer). “Israel/Palestine Conflict May Lead To Nuclear War.” Muslim Media Network. January 15th, 2009. <http://muslimobserver.com/israelpalestine-conflict-may-lead-to-nuclear-war/>

Once again the Palestinian/Israeli conflict spirals out of control. However, this particular battle has produced circumstantial evidence that the conflict has become more dangerous than ever before. Unless a permanent solution is found soon, the violence may increase in severity until the conflict ends tragically. In the latest fighting, Israel has bombed the HAMAS controlled city of Gaza for the stated reason of neutralizing HAMAS and stopping them from firing rockets into Southern Israel. As of the date of this article, approximately 900 Palestinians and 15 Israelis have been killed. HAMASâ€™ stated reasons for firing the rockets is to end the siege of Gaza by Israel which HAMAS alleges is preventing the free movement of people and goods and causing a humanitarian crisis. Israel denies the existence of a humanitarian crisis and refuses to end the siege of Gaza unless HAMAS recognizes Israel or is out power. In general, what makes the Palestinian/Israeli conflict so dangerous is that half the world, (three billion people (Jews, Christians & Muslims)) are emotionally, historically and religiously attached to the land known as Israel/Palestine. This fact was demonstrated in the last few days as demonstrations erupted in more than 95 countries around the world. Moreover, due to the affordability of satellite TV, in even the most underdeveloped countries, billions of interested people are exposed to 24 hour graphic coverage of this latest battle in Gaza. Western News stations like BBC and CNN no longer have a monopoly on reporting news. Many Middle Eastern TV stations have surpassed the reach of BBC, CNN and other western media. As to graphic images, dozens of news stations like Aljazeera have been broadcasting live and prerecorded graphic images of Palestinian babies blown up into pieces by the Israeli military. One particular gruesome scene that was played over and over again was that of a three year old little girl with her heart protruding out of her body after a bomb fell on her house. Another station, Al Alam, repeated the scene of four dead babies who were placed next to each other in the same refrigerator of a morgue because of the large number of dead in Gaza. The graphic and often emotional coverage of this latest battle is inspiring the fury of the masses which in turn are putting enormous pressure on their governments to join the fight on the side of the Palestinians. This conflict is much more dangerous than most people realize. For example, Egypt is receiving so much negative media coverage for not opening its border with Gaza that People throughout the Arab and Muslim world started calling for the overthrow of the Egyptian government and demonstrators attacked Egyptian embassies in several countries. The pressure on Egypt is so intense and ruthless that a shaken Egyptian president was forced to hold two press conferences to explain his governmentâ€™s position and to distance Egypt from Israel. Similarly, the friendly nation20of Jordan came under so much pressure for not breaking diplomatic relations with Israel that King Abdullah held a publicity stunt in which he was seen donating blood for the people of Gaza and for the first time in recent memory he referred to Israel as the Enemy. Even the Saudi government was not immune from attacks and calls for the overthrow of the Saudi government. Media outlets repeated scenes of demonstrators burning the effigy of the King of Saudi Arabia with the Israeli flag wrapped around him for hundreds of millions of people to see. Saudi Arabia is perceived as a secret ally of Israel in the desire to destroy HAMAS and the refusal of the Saudi government to allow demonstrations against Israel only reinforced this belief. Whatever the truth, the Saudi government was so shaken by the attacks against it and the constant portrayal of the Saudi King wrapped in the Israeli flag that the official Saudi media began publicizing Saudi efforts to raise money for the people of Gaza. The conflict between Israel and the Palestinians is becoming extremely dangerous and can only be described as a ticking NUCLEAR BOMB. Currently, only Israel has nuclear weapons in the Middle East. But Iran may also go nuclear and if that happens the Arabs will try to do the same. Without a doubt, there is no conflict on earth that has the same global impact as the Palestinian/Israeli conflict. Because of the potential for global instability, the entire world must do all it can to bring peace between the Palestinians and Israelis. The question is can this conflict be solved after many wars failed to end the conflict? The answer is YES but time is running out. Currently, there are four proposals to the Israel/Palestinian conflict and three have been attempted and failed. The first is that the Israelis and Palestinians continue fighting until one submits to the other, a plan that has been tried and failed. The second is a plan where both people separate by creating two separate countries. This plan is referred to as the two state solution and all attempts to implement it have failed. The third is to divide the Palestinian territories and place them under the control of Egypt and Jordan. This solution has been tried (1948-1967) and also failed because it did not address the core of the conflict. The fourth solution is based on integration of both Israelis and Palestinians in one nation and is the only solution that has proven successful. For the last 20 years the world has focused on the two state (two country) solution which has clearly failed. However, contrary to unanimous belief, neither the Palestinians nor the Israelis are to blame for the failure of the two state solution. The two state solution failed because the concept of creating two separate countries by dividing Israel/Palestine was and still is a difficult pill to swallow for Israelis & Palestinians. It is a fact that Israelis and Palestinians have religious, historical and emotional attachments to every square inch of the land that include s Israel and Palestine and neither side is eager to embrace permanent separation or â€œamputationâ€ as described by Israeli novelist Amos Oz. Consequently, it is highly unlikely that permanent separation will lead to permanent peace. In light of the above facts some may think that a solution is impossible. NOT TRUE. The Palestinian/Israeli conflict can be solved as long as both sides give up the notion that they deserve exclusive control and rule over Israel/Palestine. In light of the attachments that both parties have for the same territory, the solution cannot be in separating but in finding a formula for living together. Many Israelis and Palestinians agree that Israel/Palestine is indivisible. Thus, the solution lies in uniting Israelis and Palestinians in one country while guaranteeing both sides equality and absolute security. What is being proposed here is the creation of two sovereign states similar to New York and New Jersey, joined together in a confederation to form one country. To illustrate further, after occupying the West Bank and Gaza in 1967, Israel could have annexed those territories into Israel by providing the Palestinians with Israeli citizenship. Israel did not do this and instead chose to treat the West Bank and Gaza as part of Israel without granting the Palestinians citizenship, equality or political participation. Legally, Palestinians were and continue to have the same status as American blacks in the 19th century. Israel did not integrate the Palestinians into Israel because Israelis were afraid that the Palestinians may one day outnumber the Jews and vote Israel out of existence. While this is a legitimate concern, Jews and Israelis who fear equality for Palestinians assume that granting the Palestinians equality would lead to the destruction of Israel. This is a false assumption.

## Case

### Framing

#### The role of the ballot is to vote for the debater who best maximizes expected foreseen wellbeing

#### Moral realism is true- pain and pleasure are only intrinsic values

**Gray 09** [Gray, James W. "An Argument for Moral Realism." Ethical Realism. N.p., 07 Oct. 2009. Web. 04 Sept. 2015. <https://ethicalrealism.wordpress.com/2009/10/07/an-argument-for-moral-realism/>. MA in philosophy from San Jose State University (2008)]

**If we have evidence** that **anything** in particular **has intrinsic value**, then we also have evidence that **moral realism is true**. Our experiences of pleasure and pain are probably the most powerful evidence of intrinsic value because such experiences are tied to our belief that they have intrinsic value. My argument that pain has intrinsic disvalue is basically the following: We experience that pain is bad. We experience that pain is important. The disvalue of pain is irreducible. The disvalue of pain is real. If pain is bad in the sense of being important, irreducible, and real, then pain has intrinsic disvalue. Therefore, pain has intrinsic disvalue. I am not certain that the premises are true, but I currently find good reasons for accepting them. Therefore, we have reason for accepting the conclusion. The conclusion could be read saying, “We have reason to believe that pain has intrinsic disvalue.” If we accept that **pain has intrinsic disvalue**, then we will simultaneously accept moral realism.1 In order to examine the plausibility of my argument, I will examine each of the premises: We experience that pain is bad. We know pain is bad **because of our experience** of it. If someone described their pain as extremely wonderful, we would doubt they are feeling pain. Either the person is lying or doesn’t know what the word “pain” means. When a child decides not to touch fire because it causes pain, we understand the justification. **It would be strange to ask** the child, “So what? **What’s wrong with pain**?” We experience that pain is important. If pain is important in the relevant sense, then it can provide us reason to do something without merely helping us fulfill our desires. In other words, we must accept the following: The badness of pain isn’t just an instrumental value. The badness of **pain is a final end**. Pain’s badness isn’t an instrumental value – Pain’s disvalue is not an instrumental disvalue because pain can be quite useful to us. **Pain** can tell us when we are unhealthy or injured. We evolved pain because **i**t’**s** **essential** **to** our **survival**. Pain’s bad for a different kind of reason. Pain’s disvalue is found in our negative experience, and this is why pain is a candidate for having an intrinsic disvalue. Whenever someone claims that something has intrinsic value, we need to make sure that it’s not just good because it’s instrumentally valuable. If it’s merely useful at bringing about something else, then it’s not good in and of itself (as intrinsic values are). Pain is perhaps the perfect example of something that is useful but bad. If usefulness was the only kind of value, then pain would actually be good because it helps us in many ways. Pain’s badness isn’t just our dislike of pain – We dislike **pain** because it **feels bad**.2 If pain didn’t feel bad, then we wouldn’t have such a strong desire to avoid intense pain. Pain means “feels bad” and it **is manifested in various experiences**, such as touching fire. **We have to know the meaning of “bad”** in order to understand pain at all. **We attain an understanding of “bad” just by feeling pain**. If pain was only bad because we dislike it, then we couldn’t say that “pain really matters.” Instead, the badness of pain would just be a matter of taste. However, we don’t just say pain is bad because we dislike it. We also say pain is bad because of how it feels. Avoiding **pain is a final end** – A final end is a goal people recognize as being **worthy of being sought after for its own sake**. Money is not a final end **because** it is only valuable when used to do something else. Pleasure and pain-avoidance are final ends because they are taken t be worthy of being avoided for their own sake. We know that avoiding pain makes sense even when **it doesn’t lead to anything else** of value, so avoiding pain is a final end.3 If I want to take an aspirin, someone could ask, “Why did you do that?” I could answer, “I have a headache.” This should be the end of the story. We understand that avoiding pain makes sense. It would be absurd for someone to continue to question me and say, “What difference does having a headache make? That’s not a good reason to take an aspirin!”4 Both realists and anti-realists can agree that pain is bad, and they can both agree that pain is a final end. Our desire to avoid pain is non-instrumental and such a desire is experienced as justified. (However, the ant-realist might argue that it is only taken to be justified because of human psychology.) If pain is a final end, then we understand (a) that pain is important and (b) it makes sense to say that we ought to avoid pain. **Pain’s disvalue is irreducible**. **If the badness of pain was reducible to nonmoral properties, then we should be able to describe what** “bad” means **through a non-moral description**. **However**, **we** currently **have no** way of understanding pain’s badness as being something else. We can’t describe pain’s badness in non-moral terms. If someone needs to know what ” bad” means, they need to experience something bad. To say that some moral states are irreducible is just like saying that some mental states are irreducible. Pain itself can’t be described through a non-mental description. If we told people the mental states involved with pain, they would still not know what pain is because they need to know what it feels like. Someone could argue that **“bad” means the same thing as** something like **“pain,”** and then we would find out that the badness of pain could be reduced to something else. However, pain and the badness of pain are conceptually separable. For example, I could find out that something else is bad other than pain. They could then reply that “bad” means the same thing as a disjunction of various other bad things, such as “pain or malicious intent.” But people who disagree about what constitutes what is “bad” aren’t just arguing about the meaning of the word “bad.” They are arguing about what has the property “bad.”5 Additionally, the word “bad” would no longer have any importance. If “bad” just means “pain or malicious intent,” then why care about it? Why ought I refrain from causing pain or having a malicious intent? It could be that we can find out that “bad” and “pain” are identical, but then “bad” might not be entirely reducible to “pain” (or a disjunction of bad things). We might still think that there are two legitimate descriptions at work. The “pain” description and the “bad” description. (Some people think water is H2O through an identity relation similar to this.) This sort of irreducible identity relation require us to deny that pain is “important.” (If the identity theory did require us to deny that pain is “important,” then we would have a good reason to reject such an identity theory.) I have given reason to think the word “bad” is irreducible, but I haven’t proven it. If someone could prove that pain isn’t important, and we can reduce pain to something else, then I will be proven wrong. I just don’t see any reason to agree with that position at this time. I discuss the badness of pain as irreducible in more detail in my essays “Objection to Moral Realism Part 1: Is/Ought Gap” and “Objections to Moral Realism Part 3: Argument from Queerness.” The badness of pain is real. **If the badness of pain is real**, **then everyone’s pain is bad**. Pain isn’t bad just for me, but not for you. It states that **we don’t** all merely **share a subjective preference** in avoiding pain, **but** that pain’s badness is something worthy of being avoided and helping others avoid it. Why does it seem reasonable to believe pain’s badness to be real? There are at least four reasons. One, I experience that **my pain hurts and I know that other people do as well**. Two, it’s not just people’s subjective preferences in question. People hate pain because of how it feels. Three, people’s pain exists (and if pain exists, then the badness of the pain exists). Four, I see no reason to deny that the badness of other people’s pain exists. I will discuss this final consideration in more detail when I discuss anti-realist objections. We have no good reason to deny that pain is bad. We experience that pain is bad for ourselves, and other people experience that pain is bad for themselves as well. **Even though pain is subjective,** there is nothing delusional about our belief that pain is bad. **It’s not just a** personal **like or a dislike**. We don’t just agree to treat other people’s pain as important as part of a social contract. The belief that the badness of pain is real and “pain is bad no matter who experiences it” will be rejected by anti-realists. If I gave food to the hungry, it would be absurd to question why I did it. Imagine someone who disagrees with my action and says, “Other people’s pain is irrelevant. You should only try to avoid pain for yourself, so feeding the hungry is stupid.” This person’s position is counterintuitive to the point of absurdity. We have all accepted that other people’s pain matters. It makes sense to feed the hungry, it makes sense to give to charity, and it makes sense to give someone an aspirin who has a headache. We don’t have to benefit from helping other people. To deny that “pain is bad no matter who experiences it” isn’t a position that many people can find acceptable. (I suppose some sociopaths might find it acceptable.) If pain is bad, important, irreducible, and real, then pain has intrinsic disvalue. I want to suggest this premise to be justified in virtue of the very meaning of intrinsic value. If pain is bad, important (worthy of being desired), irreducible, and real; then I think we have already established that pain has intrinsic disvalue by definition. We have established **moral facts** that could **give us what we ought to do**, such as, “We ought to avoid pain.” Such an ought judgment is not merely based on my personal belief or desire; it’s based on the fact that pain is important no matter who experiences it. Conclusion: Pain has intrinsic disvalue If my premises are true, then the conclusion follows. I have given reason for accepting the premises, so we have some reason for accepting the conclusion, and the conclusion entails the truth of moral realism. I will take all of my premises to be sufficiently justified, but I will consider why someone might decide that the badness of pain “isn’t real.” An anti-realist could attempt to deny that “pain is bad no matter who experiences it.” The strongest evidence that badness is real is the fact that denying it seems to require unjustified philosophical commitments. I will attempt to show that the alternatives are less justified in the next section.

#### Moral uncertainty means we prevent extinction

**Bostrom 11** --¶ (2011) Nick Bostrom, Future of Humanity Institute, Oxford Martin School & Faculty of Philosophy

These reflections on moral uncertainty suggest an alternative, complementary way of looking at existential risk. Let me elaborate. Our present understanding of axiology might well be confused. We may not now know—at least not in concrete detail—what outcomes would count as a big win for humanity; we might not [or] even yet be able to imagine the best ends of our journey. If we are indeed profoundly uncertain about our ultimate aims, then we should recognize that there is a great option value in preserving**—**and ideally improving—our ability to recognize value and to steer the future accordingly. Ensuring that there will be a future version of humanity with great powers and a propensity to use them wisely is plausibly the best way available to us to increase the probability that the future will contain a lot of value. To do this, we must prevent any existential catastrophe.

#### Their role of the ballot is merely an impact filter- it says to prioritize anti-blackness because it results in suffering- but extinctiojn causes infinite suffering so that would shift your role as the judge. Also outweighs on reversibility- the impacts of the 1nc can never be reversed but we can solve their intervening impacts.

#### Framing issues through large scale impacts also generate better attention to draw it towards small-scale impacts so the 1nc’s method is the best to generate attention

### Solvency

#### The aff removes restrictions which amplifies anti-semitic speech which results in harassment and psychological trauma

**Rossman-Benjamin 15** [Tammi Rossman-Benjamin (ammi Rossman-Benjamin is a lecturer at the University of California, Santa Cruz, and the co-founder and director of the Amcha Initiative, a nonprofit that combats campus anti-Semitism.), 11-9-2015, "Op-Ed: Why campus anti-racism protests are bad for the Jews," Jewish Telegraphic Agency, <http://www.jta.org/2015/12/07/news-opinion/opinion/op-ed-why-campus-anti-racism-protests-are-bad-for-the-jews>] NB

In no time, that question took on national significance. Butler’s hunger strike has sparked a national student movement demanding an end to “systemic and structural racism.” Again we asked, could this be a positive development for Jewish students, who themselves suffer systemic and structural anti-Semitism? On far too many campuses Jewish students report being harassed, assaulted, threatened, vilified and discriminated against, their property defaced and destroyed, and their events disrupted and shut down. Could this new anti-racism movement finally help provide Jewish students the attention they deserve? Unfortunately, the current rash of campus protests has shown itself to be far more likely to hurt Jewish students than to help them. There are three main reasons why. First, university administrators are less likely to address anti-Semitism in the wake of the Mizzou-inspired protests. In part, this is because administrators are so overwhelmed with meeting or deflecting the demands of protesters — and making sure they themselves do not meet the same fate as Mizzou’s president and chancellor — they simply do not have the time or energy to focus on Jewish students. Administrators are also afraid of appearing to favor Jewish students. Recently, I called a top administrator at the University of Central Florida to discuss some neo-Nazi fliers that had been posted in and around UCF dormitories. I expressed my dismay that although the fliers had been discovered several days before, the university had yet to make a public statement about them. The administrator responded that he was afraid to do so lest it be seen by campus protesters as pandering to Jewish interests and lead to further campus unrest. University administrators too busy or too scared to address anti-Semitism leave Jewish students vulnerable and unprotected. Second, anti-Israel student groups who often target Jewish students for harassment and discrimination have opportunistically aligned themselves with anti-racism protesters to more forcefully promote their anti-Zionist agenda. At the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, for example, anti-Israel groups have insinuated into the protesters’ demands a call for UNC to immediately divest from “Israeli apartheid.” The manipulative injection of such demands into the anti-racism movement and the alliances being forged will likely make the campus climate even more hostile, threatening and unsafe for Jewish students. Finally, Jewish students themselves have been accused of racism for speaking out about the anti-Semitism they experience. For example, on an official University of California, Santa Cruz website dedicated to educating the campus community about subtle forms of bigotry known as “microaggressions,” one of the examples given is a Jewish student’s statement to an African-American student: “I don’t get why you’re excluding me like this. I’m Jewish; I know oppression.” Even though the Jewish student is simply expressing feelings of marginalization and oppression, the statement is considered a microaggression because of the student’s socioeconomic status. Indeed, in a campus climate hypersensitive to the intersectionality of race and class, Jewish students may not even be able to talk about anti-Semitism without being labeled racist. While no one knows for sure how long the current campus unrest will last or how much impact it will ultimately have, there are clear signs that Jewish students will not be among its beneficiaries and are quite likely to be among its greatest casualties.

#### UC system has to condemn anti-Semitism – pro-Palestinian movements are an excuse for anti-Semitic violence

**Rossman 16** [Tammi Rossman-Benjamin (faculty at UC Santa Cruz and founder of the AMCHA Initiative, a nonprofit that combats anti-Semitism on college campuses), "Divestment movement inspires threats to Jewish students," Mercury News, 1/12/2016] AZ

We may never know what motivated Faisal Mohammad’s stabbing spree at UC Merced. We do know that whatever hatred filled his heart found expression in the brutal stabbing of innocent victims. We also know that the freshman’s rampage and the massive tragedy in San Bernardino, where one of the assailants did his undergraduate and graduate work at California State University as recently as 2014, have caused students across California to feel vulnerable. This is particularly true for many Jewish students who are struggling with an escalation of hateful anti-Semitic acts at UC. This past fall, swastikas and “F— Jews” were carved into multiple cars, and a female Jewish student was followed and harassed by a male member of the campus group Students for Justice in Palestine. Last year, swastikas were spray-painted on a Jewish fraternity, and “grout out the Jews” defaced the Hillel House at UC Davis; “Zionists should be sent to the gas chamber” was scrawled at UC Berkeley; fliers blaming Jews for 9/11 were posted at UC Santa Barbara, and a candidate for the UCLA student judicial board was challenged that her Jewishness rendered her ineligible. Frighteningly, these are not isolated incidents. A survey conducted recently of 229 Jewish students on UC’s 10 campuses revealed 70 percent of the respondents had experienced anti-Semitism. The respondents said hostile actions are directly linked to virulently anti-Israel Boycott, Divestment, Sanctions (BDS) campaigns. As some describe: I’m in a Jewish interest sorority, and during divestment we’re encouraged not to wear [our sorority] letters. During BDS I actually avoid Hillel, the quad and even my sorority because I just really don’t want to have to deal with how unsafe campus feels. Any time a BDS activity occurs on campus, the amount of swastikas found in libraries has gone up. When our divestment motion passed, two days later there were swastikas on our AEPi house. I actually didn’t feel safe wearing my star or my [fraternity] letters. As a result of BDS, I don’t feel comfortable showing my faith anymore. The reality on UC campuses today is that almost every anti-Semitic act can be directly linked to BDS. And every BDS campaign has resulted in Jewish students reporting feeling threatened, harassed, bullied and unsafe. It’s not hard to understand why. BDS is steeped in hatred. Coordinated internationally by Palestinian groups committed to the elimination of Israel, including terrorist organization Hamas, whose charter calls for the murder of Jews worldwide, BDS campaigns routinely employ hate-filled rhetoric and imagery intended to deny the only Jewish state’s right to exist and promote murder of Israelis and Jews. Pro-BDS student groups not only seek to vilify Israel but engage in fomenting hatred toward all of Israel’s presumed supporters. BDS groups routinely attempt to shut down Jewish student events and urge their members to avoid interacting with students in Jewish organizations such as Hillel, Chabad or AEPi. Commendably, the UC Regents have recently acknowledged that the university must address its serious anti-Semitism problem. They have formed a task force to do just that. At the Regents meeting next week, it’s imperative that they acknowledge the painfully obvious connection between BDS and anti-Semitism. UC must acknowledge and condemn not only blatant acts of anti-Semitism, such as swastikas and assaults, but instances of hateful anti-Israel expression that incite these despicable acts — before it is faced with another tragedy.

#### Anti-Israel movements won't form coalitions – movements only unite a tiny minority of students

**Bard 16** [Mitchell Bard (Executive Director of AICE and Jewish Virtual Library, pHD in political science from UCLA), "Amid BDS Activism, Divestment Falters on College Campuses," 8/5/2016] AZ

Divestment votes are also taken by a tiny minority of students and should not be viewed as in any way reflecting the views of the majority. Most students don’t know or care about the BDS issue and when it is explained to them, their opinion turns more negative. Most students expect their student government to improve their financial and academic lives rather than engage in political grandstanding that does nothing for their welfare. Practically, the student government votes in favor of divestment are meaningless since they have no power to influence university investment policies and university officials have consistently said they oppose the antisemitic BDS campaign and have no intention of divesting or boycotting. What BDS campaigns do is roil the campus, pit students against each other, and, to at least some extent, tarnish Israel’s image among a minority of students who are attuned to the debate. Deterring and defeating antisemitic BDS resolutions does not happen in a vacuum. Students, supported by Hillel, an the alphabet soup of Jewish and pro-Israel organizations and philanthropists have educated themselves, rallied their classmates, and put in the time and effort to prevent their campuses from being hijacked by a handful of students committed to tarnishing Israel’s image. Israel’s detractors are also determined to appropriate the language of the Black Lives Matter movement and to form coalitions with ethnic and religious groups. Pro-Israel students are encouraged to build coalitions, but have generally been less successful, in part because the BDSers have been more effective in communicating their specious narrative of Israelis as white, Jewish, colonial oppressors of people of color. Sadly, many well-meaning students are misled to believe they are somehow helping the Palestinians by supporting BDS even while Palestinians themselves say the movement is hurting them. They have been bullied into hypocritically focusing on the plight of Palestinians in the disputed territories while ignoring the most serious human rights abusers in the world, including those in Syria who are slaughtering Palestinians and turning hundreds of thousands into refugees. More seriously, BDS advocates ignore the raison d’ê·tre of the movement — namely the denial of the Jewish right to self-determination in their homeland.

#### BDS strengthens the right wing elites--- that keeps them in power and stifles actual reform

**AMEINU 16** [“What’s the Problem With BDS? A Progressive Critique” The Third Narrative- Two states, peace and justice for Israelis and Palestinians. AMEINU.2016/02] NB

At a cabinet meeting in May 2015, Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu put the BDS movement in the spotlight. “We are in the midst of a great struggle being waged against the State of Israel, an international campaign to blacken its name... Now, this is a phenomenon that we have known in the history of our people,” he said, invoking the Nazis. “They said we are the foundation of evil in the world. They said that we are the poisoners of the wells of humanity."19 BDS supporters claim that the attention Israel is now devoting to their movement is a testament to their success. Gershom Gorenberg noted, “In fact, the actual impact of BDS at the moment is to help Netanyahu stay in power — a favor he is returning by publicizing the movement and giving its activists an undeserved feeling of accomplishment.”20 Despite the Israeli government’s alarm, BDS has not made average Israelis feel the cost of the occupation. Instead, BDS has strengthened the Israeli right wing and given its leaders talking points that bolster Israelis’ siege mentality. Ultimately, BDS undermines key constituencies in Israel that are trying to the end the occupation, namely Israeli academics and progressive NGOs. Don Futterman, in his plea to fellow Israeli leftists not to support BDS, writes in Haaretz: If BDS ever really gets going, it will cause Israelis to circle the wagons, while our leaders purr, “They’re all anti-Semites”...[T]he propagandists currently heading Israel’s government have proven adept at using the “everyone is against us” mantra to get themselves elected, and to deflect criticism of the occupation and of our military behavior during three wars in Gaza. This “whole world hates the Jews” narrative is simplistic and appealing, shifting the blame always away from ourselves... Leftist support for BDS will only distance other Israelis from relaunching the discourse about the future of the occupation and the West Bank that we so desperately need – and that our government leaders are so desperate to avoid.21

#### BDS only serves anti-semitic rhetoric without any real political or economic impact

**AMEINU 16** [“What’s the Problem With BDS? A Progressive Critique” The Third Narrative- Two states, peace and justice for Israelis and Palestinians. AMEINU.2016/02] NB

The ideology of the BDS movement and the anti-Zionist left has been ably dissected and decried by more than a few left-of-center thinkers, including David Hirsch,25 Alan Johnson,26 Cary Nelson,27 Ellen Willis28 and Nancy Koppelman.29 We won’t reinvent that wheel here, but we will point out an equally distressing phenomenon – rather than trying to prompt tangible change in the Middle East, the raison d’être of many BDS campaigns is to create platforms to spout anti-Israel and anti-Zionist rhetoric. In Boycotting Israel Is Wrong: The Progressive Path to Peace Between Palestinians and Israel, Philip Mendes and Nick Dyrenfurth describe a highly publicized dispute in Brooklyn’s Park Slope Food Co-op over a boycott resolution, which eventually failed: Arguably the...‘no’ vote paled in comparison with the national and international exposure the Park Slope example garnered for the BDS movement, allowing an extremist interpretation of the Israel-Palestine conflict to be widely broadcast. Indeed this increasingly seemed to be the very purpose of BDS campaigns.30 BDS organizers on North American university campuses have presented a host of divestment resolutions to student governments. Even when they’ve passed, they have had no impact on the actual investment decisions of universities. These decisions are handled by trustees and advisors, who have overwhelmingly ignored the resolutions. BDS advocates know that. The only concrete result of their resolutions, like “Israel Apartheid Week” exhibits and other pro-BDS efforts on campus, is the vilification of Israel, its policies and, in too many cases, its very existence. There is nothing wrong, per se, with espousing a specific perspective on geopolitics. But that is all that BDS organizers are achieving when they attract attention on campus and in church organizations, unions and other settings. In the process, well-meaning people get the false impression that they can provide concrete help to the Palestinian people by not buying hummus, calling for Elton John to refrain from performing in Tel Aviv or boycotting Israeli academics and Motorola. A related shortcoming of the BDS movement is that its advocates have no concrete plan to achieve their stated objectives. When pressed, they can an offer no practical political path, no route from A to B. They seem to rely on a vague dream in which the Israeli people will someday feel so isolated and under so much pressure that they will demand an end to the occupation and other changes. Israel has one of the world’s strongest and most stable economies. Even if economic boycotts and related measures grew more popular internationally, it would take many years before they would have a significant impact on Israeli policies. Neither Palestinians nor Israelis can afford to wait that long. And as the weaker and more vulnerable population, Palestinians are certain to bear the brunt of continued conflict, violence and a status quo that denies their basic democratic rights, including their right to self- determination.

#### BDS props up the Palestinian leadership which results in worse consequences for Israelis

**Halevi 16** [Yossi Klein Halevi, 6-29-2016, "Why the anti-Israel boycott movement is an immoral threat to peace," latimes, <http://www.latimes.com/opinion/op-ed/la-oe-halevi-bds-is-immoral-20160628-snap-story.html>] NB

Like a majority of Israelis, I recognize that the ongoing occupation of the Palestinian people is a long-term threat to my country’s well-being. The occupation challenges the integrity of Israeli democracy and threatens its Jewish majority, which is demographically essential for maintaining the only corner of the planet where Jews are sovereign. For these reasons, a majority of Israelis, according to polls, supports a two-state solution. But that same majority of moderate Israelis is deeply wary of the ultimate goal of the Palestinian leadership — both the nationalist Fatah party and the Islamist militant group Hamas. As the Palestinian media broadcast on a daily basis, the goal isn’t two states living in peace but a single Arab-majority state in which Jews would be at best a tolerated minority. And given the fate of minorities throughout the Middle East today, the likely scenario is far more nightmarish. The Palestinian national movement as a whole intends to destroy Jewish sovereignty through the “right of return,” the demand that descendants of Palestinian refugees from the 1948 war — a war of aggression initiated by Arab states against Israel’s creation — move to the Jewish state, rather than to a future Palestinian state. That would create an Arab majority in Israel, undermining the state's Jewish identity from within. Israel would collapse. Israelis across the political spectrum well understand the chilling implications of the right of return, even if much of the international community does not. The BDS movement — whose website endorses the right of return as one of its three core goals — promotes that vision of a world without Israel. BDS dupes those of its supporters who genuinely seek a two-state solution into believing that they are working for peace. Indeed the BDS website doesn't even mention two states for two peoples among its goals. Even if Israel were to uproot every settlement, redivide Jerusalem, forfeit its claim to the holy places and return to the eight-mile-wide borders of the pre-1967 war, the BDS movement presumably would press on until Israel was erased from the map.
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#### Limits controls the internal link to all of their impacts – fairness and education require some reciprocal research burden in order for effective dialogue and clash to occur – blowing up the number of affs by including USFG as the actor puts at a unique disadvantage – we have three unique disadvantage to these affs they specifically allow

#### Ground – there’s a unique link differential between enforcement mechanisms that makes ground impossible when you’re neg. Two internal links – First, there’s a completely separate literature base for restrictions versus the federal government, for example restrictions for colleges include things like firing professors, but the government does things like threaten states with market restrictions which means that all of our enforcement links and solvency deficits are non-existent which means even if they win a disad to the quality of ground, we have won that there’s not quantity of ground because it’s non-existent nor predictable. Two, we lose disads based on the passage of the plan, for example the endowments disad which is contingent on colleges passing it and pissing off donors, if the courts do it we lose access to all of those link arguments.

#### *Our impact outweighs—*

#### Debate is uniquely a game and teams are incentivized to run towards to margin to get the advantage, a limited topic is necessary to make that manageable and ensure the negative can compete with the affirmative.

#### There is literally no value to a game if it is unfair – it turns any education offense the affirmative can get because if negative’s aren’t prepared to test the aff, all discussion is surface level and either non-unique or meaningless because we aren’t taught our to defend those positions adequately.

#### You should view this as an intrinsic good to the activity – debate is a game of inches not miles, slight advantages are something that can let people run away with any individual debate.

#### Generics uniquely outweigh – on a topic where neg ground is already limited and the aff can pick and choose from a laundry list of 520 plus restrictions, even if they win aff flex is good in general, it’s not on this topic, because it explodes aff innovation and destroys the negs ability to go for generics by the time the TOC comes around and everyone is breaking new affs, the neg needs generics – topicality is about up till the TOC and what the year looks like.

#### The Add on argument independently outweighs – aff can generate advantages based on the mechanism of the plan like court legitimacy advantages, that means there’s offense that the neg could have never predicted for

#### Now topical version of the aff solves 100% of your offense – just pass the plan via public colleges and universities and it solves all of the aff and you can still have all of the same core of the topic advantages.